



For Butter Richness Without Butter Expense

Use **CRISCO**
For Frying—For Shortening
For Cake Making

In some homes the butter problem grows greater day by day. In others, Crisco is used. With Crisco, women obtain the results given by the finest creamery butter, and at half the cost.

Crisco fulfills practically every cooking need where expensive butter formerly was necessary. It allows the more delicate flavors of the food itself to be tasted.

When Crisco has proven itself to you in a few ways, you will plan all manner of ways to use it.



Henry Waterhouse Trust Company, Ltd.,

STATEMENT OF CONDITION, JUNE 30, 1915.

ASSETS.	LIABILITIES.
Cash on hand and in bank, \$116,013.80	Capital \$200,000.00
Bonds 28,040.00	Undivided profits 24,316.47
Real estate 96,513.43	Trust and agency accounts 482,101.89
Stocks and other investments 71,183.58	Dividends unpaid 2,400.00
Mortgages secured by real estate 77,431.48	
Loans, demand and time 339,289.09	
Furniture and fixtures 5,000.00	
Accrued interest receivable 5,341.98	
\$708,818.36	\$708,818.36

Territory of Hawaii, City and County of Honolulu, ss.
I, A. N. Campbell, Treasurer of the Henry Waterhouse Trust Co., Ltd., do solemnly swear that the above statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.
A. N. CAMPBELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of July, A. D. 1915.
JNO. GUILD,
Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit.
6211 July 9, 17, 24, 31.

The ride to Haleiwa over the Oahu Railway is one of the most inspiring on this island. The finest surf in the country is passed en route and the mountain and plain scenery is nowhere excelled.

Therefore, tickets at
Wells-Fargo & Co.

Haleiwa

We attend to Checking and Sealing of
BAGGAGE

on all outgoing steamers without inconvenience to passengers

We also make a specialty of Furniture Moving.

Union-Pacific Transfer Company, Ltd.

U. S. Mail Carriers.

King St. next to Young Hotel

Phone 1875

STAR-BULLETIN 75 CENTS PER MONTH

JUDGE STUART SAYS NEUTRALS SHOULD DEFINE RIGHTS ON SEA

Suggests That U. S. Call Meeting of Representatives of All Powers Not at War

That now or never is the time to settle once for all the rights of neutral nations on the high seas, is the opinion of Judge T. B. Stuart of Honolulu, who proposes that the American government issue a call to all of the nations of the world now neutral in the matter of the great European war, in order that the neutrals may clearly define their rights and take steps to see that the belligerents observe them.

Judge Stuart has set forth his opinion, ably supported by international law, in the following statement prepared for the Star-Bulletin:

"The trouble that the United States and all neutral nations are involved in today seems to arise

"First: Through treating solemn treaties and duties under the international law as being entitled to no respect;

"Second: Through mutual disagreement by the belligerents as to the rights of noncombatants and neutrals;

"Third: On account of the new instruments of warfare, namely, the aircraft and the submarine.

"Belgium, from her position, and her treaties, could not be otherwise than neutral in the dispute between Austria and Serbia, but Germany wished to strike France and England through Belgian territory, and it is claimed that without a shadow of right or excuse, in violation of her compacts, completely ignored and violated all the rights of this neutral nation and sought in fact to destroy her national existence.

"Immediately England, as the leader of the Allies, while complaining bitterly of Germany, sends forth her decrees in admiralty, which may properly be said not to be based on any law of nations, but claim their validity from these decrees alone, in disregard of the rights of neutral nations as they have heretofore been understood.

"England claims the right of search upon the high seas and the capture of neutral vessels on the high seas, and the taking of them into her ports, judging their cargoes, not by the law of nations, but by her decrees and amended decrees in admiralty, as to whether they contain contraband of war or not.

"That the United States and all neutral nations had the right to carry on commerce with all the combatants as though war did not exist, can hardly be gainsaid. The only thing assigned against it is the assumed ownership of the high seas by England, through her decrees in admiralty. True, she might, under the old law of nations, blockade any German port by an effective blockade (not a paper one), and shut out all illegitimate commerce with Germany; but a neutral vessel outside the three-mile limit of the coast of a nation is on the high seas. No power can rightfully interfere with her, and to capture her through force and condemn and take her cargo is in conflict with the rights of neutrals under the law of nations as it has heretofore existed. England has recognized this as being true by making compensation in every instance to the full value of the property so taken, but the making of compensation, even to double the amount of the property so taken, does not validate the wrongful act in any respect.

"The compensation or double compensation for the injury committed does not make the act right, but is simply an admission that the act itself is wrong and indefensible. The difference in the English method and the German method of violating international law as to the rights of neutrals lies not in the essence of the act, but the difference in their magnitude. England takes the vessels; Germany sinks them with all on board. It will not do to admit that any nation has the right, by her individual decrees, to restrict the rights of other nations upon the high seas. Nations actually at war have the right to capture the vessels of each other, whether they be vessels of war or engaged in commerce. But even between battleships it has always been a duty to save as many of a sinking vessel as possible. Humanity demands such action. When it comes to unarmed vessels, there is no war that has heretofore existed that has countenanced the wanton destruction of human life by sinking them. It has been said that when an American sets foot on an English boat that he is, in contemplation of the law of nations, on English soil. Be it so; he is nevertheless a noncombatant and a neutral, and were he upon the land there would be no justification for taking his life. It cannot be said that the German armies have the right to annihilate the noncombatants on the land surrounded by the war zone, even though they are of the enemy. If they have not this right on land, they surely do not have it on the high seas, which are common property.

"Warring nations often justify their actions as a matter of reprisal or retaliation for similar acts on the part of the enemy, but until the present war it has not been thought that the means so adopted could be enforced against neutrals.

"Quoting a few propositions of law and leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions, we may say far more toward enlightening the common understanding than by giving an individual version of it.

"Retortion: Is the enactment of a tariff by one nation to offset an injurious tariff enacted by another. This has never been recognized as a cause of war.

"Reprisals: The term is applied to the action of a state in doing injury to another state or its subjects, generally by seizing or destroying property, in order to compensate the state making the reprisal for injuries received from the other state, or to compel such state to adopt or relinquish a certain course of conduct. Reprisals are almost certain to result in war if the nation subjected thereto feels that its strength will in any way justify it in entering on hostilities.

"Blockade: Is a war measure, that sometimes has been introduced in times of peace as a measure of constraint. The practice of nations has differed but the later tendency is to exercise the blockade only against vessels belonging to the nation whose ports are blockaded and to allow vessels of other states to pass freely and it is only when it is limited in effect that its legality is admitted by statesmen and publicists.

"During a state of war all the subjects of one belligerent are enemies of all the subjects of the other. Every kind of trade or commercial dealing or intercourse between the subjects of the belligerent powers is absolutely forbidden and all vessels or other kinds of property engaged in trade with the enemy are subject to condemnation.

"A belligerent vessel of war cannot be sold or transferred to a neutral, even in a neutral port, so as to exempt her from seizure, however bonafide the transaction may be.

"That property of the enemy is generally liable to capture at sea is conceded, the only important exception being the case of enemy cargoes in neutral vessels which are now quite frequently exempt.

"There have been, however, many suggestions in favor of exempting such property from capture on the sea as it is now exempt on land. The United States has always taken a strong position in favor of such a rule, and the same disposition has been shown by some European governments. Up to this time, England, as the possessor of a great navy, has been its chief opponent, but there is now a strong sentiment in that country in its favor, in view of the greatness of its mercantile marine, and there seems reason to think that, supported as the doctrine is by nearly all the writers of the different nations, the practice in conformity with this view will greatly extend.

"Ransom is a repurchase by the original owner from the captor of property, most generally a vessel or its cargo, which has been seized as a prize. Ransom has been prohibited in Great Britain since the beginning of the nineteenth century as tending to relax the energies of war.

"Ransom is carried into effect by the commander of the captured vessel giving to the captor a ransom bill by which he agrees that a stipulated sum shall be paid to the captor, and this acts as a safe conduct against capture by other ships of war until arrival at a stipulated port. When ransoms were permitted in England the English courts refused to allow the enemy to sue on a ransom bill during the war, but this objection to suit has not obtained in other countries.

"A neutral state is under the absolute obligation to do nothing which will aid one belligerent to the injury of the other. The nation is in general not to furnish munitions of war to a belligerent. But there is no obligation upon it to prevent its subjects from doing so, and neutral subjects may freely sell at home to a belligerent purchaser or carrier to a belligerent power, arms and munitions of war subject only to the possibility of their seizure as contraband while in transit.

"United States Supreme Court, 3d Wall. 514.

"It is highly probable that the United States will maintain that both Great Britain and Germany are violating the law of nations, and it is of the greatest interest to all nations that the extraordinary claims made by these powers respectively should be settled now, and not pass into a rule on account of the success of the one or the other of these contestants. We of the United States are claiming neutral rights, and we should see to it that they are not destroyed. They are more important to the world at large than is the success of the one or the other of the present belligerents.

"England has now in her ports 27 American ships with their cargoes. She holds nearly all of them on the ground that they were carrying food that must eventually reach Germany. It seems to us that England is claiming too much when she says she may destroy the commerce of the United States on the high seas, being only liable to pay the value of the vessels and the cargo. There is a principle involved which we cannot well admit, no matter how friendly we may feel to Great Britain. The high seas are as much the territory of the United States as they are that of Great Britain, and as such the territory of any other neutral nation, no matter how small, as they are of Great Britain. Unless we admit that might makes right, and that England is dictator to whom all nations must bow, we must seriously object to this capture of neutral vessels on the high seas, and the taking of them into English ports.

"We are supposed to stand in the same position in regard to our trade that we occupied at the beginning of the war. We have done nothing to forfeit any of our rights. We have done nothing to prevent us from selling food stuffs abroad as we have done heretofore. While England rightfully objects to the sinking of her unarmed passenger ships, she should not object to the law of 'ransom' as it has heretofore existed, and which she has always opposed on account of her naval power. Especially

is this true in regard to the new war engine, the submarine. It cannot take a vessel into port. It cannot care for its passengers. It must either cease entirely its war upon any unarmed ships or the law of ransom should be enforced in its favor.

"If, in the case of the Lusitania, the submarine could have resorted to the captain of the Lusitania the vessel and its cargo, and that sale would be enforced and acknowledged in the English courts, then surely there would have been no excuse for sinking the vessel, but until some such law as this is acknowledged by Great Britain, has she the right to complain simply because she will not pay ransom? Under the enforcement of the doctrine of 'ransom,' the life of the occupants of the ship would always be safe.

"If the doctrine of 'reprisal' against Great Britain is to be enforced by the United States as it attempted to enforce it in 1812, it would probably take the form of blockade of Canadian ports and capturing of vessels belonging to England going into or from said ports and taking them into our own ports and condemning them in our courts on account of the unlawful acts of Great Britain in reference to our commerce.

"Canada stands closer to the United States in regard to commercial transactions than it does to Great Britain. It is only on account of the excellent form of government that Great Britain has guaranteed to Canada that the mother country is so much respected. If the United States should continue that form of government and the perfect autonomy of Canada as it exists now, saving no greater rights to the United States than England possesses, it is difficult to see where any serious objection could be made to a change of the ruling power. The people of the United States almost universally are against the acquisition of any further territory by the United States, probably nine out of ten of the American people would be glad to see the Philippines disposed of, even if they had to be given away. We have no desire for territory in Mexico or territory in Canada. If the question of reprisal should come up and the United States to vindicate its rights on

the high seas should seize Canadian ports or Canadian vessels, it would be with no intention on its part to obtain territory.

"On the other hand, if we should attempt reprisal against Germany, that nation at this time has over \$100,000,000 of property in our ports that could rightfully be taken and held by us under this doctrine.

"Why should not the United States call for representatives from all neutral nations to appear at Washington and assist in settling the question of neutral rights as against the warring powers? The rights of all neutrals are the same. Should not the neutrals see to it that their rights are defined now?

"When we object to the acts of England, then England says we are unfriendly. When we object to acts of Germany, then Germany says we are unfriendly. Both are mistaken. Very much mistaken. History will show that this nation has never been so absolutely neutral in any war as in this one.

"We are contending simply for the rights of neutrals. It is of the greatest importance to us and all neutral nations that they should be maintained. For the securing of these rights there should be joint action by all neutrals."

TELLING GERMANY HOW SURVIVORS OF EMDEN MADE WAY TO SAFETY

[Associated Press]
AMSTERDAM, Netherlands. — The story of the German cruiser Emden is being told to audiences in the principal German cities in a lecture by Lieut. von Mücke. He led the party of the Emden's crew which escaped and made its way around Asia and across Turkey to Berlin and he has proved a great success as a lecturer.

FEW GERMANS IN TURKEY.

BERLIN, Germany. — The German force assisting the Turks in the Dardanelles consists of only 30 officers and 500 men, according to the Frankfurter Zeitung. There are now two German admirals in the Dardanelles district, Usdom Pasha and Merten Pasha.

THROW AWAY YOUR EYE-GLASSES

A FREE PRESCRIPTION

You Can Have Filled and Use at Home

Do you wear glasses? Are you a victim of eye-strain or other eye-weaknesses? If so, you will be glad to know that there is real hope for you. Many whose eyes were failing, say they have had their eyes restored through the principle of this wonderful free prescription. One man says, after trying it: "I was almost blind; could not see to read at all. Now I can read everything without any glasses and my eyes do not water any more. At night they would pain dreadfully; now they feel fine all the time. It was like a miracle to me." A lady who used it says: "The atmosphere seemed hazy with or without glasses, but after using this prescription for 15 days everything seems clear. I can even read fine print without glasses." It is believed that thousands who wear glasses can now discard them in a reasonable time and multitudes more will be able to strengthen their eyes so as to be spared the trouble and expense of ever getting glasses. Eye troubles of many descriptions may be wonderfully benefited by following the simple rules. Here is the prescription: Go to any active drug store and get a bottle of Opton. Fill a two-ounce bottle with warm water, drop in one Opton tablet and allow to dissolve. With this liquid, bathe the eyes two to four times daily. You should notice your eyes clear up perceptibly right from the start and inflammation will quickly disappear. If your eyes are bothering you, even a little, take steps to save them now before it is too late. Many hopelessly blind might have been saved if they had cared for their eyes in time.—advertisement.

PROFESSORS "GO DRY"

MELBOURNE.—The faculties of the University of Melbourne and its affiliated colleges have pledged themselves to abstain from the use of alcohol during the continuance of the war.

THIN FOR YEARS—

"Gains 22 Pounds in 23 Days"



"I was all run down to the very bottom," writes F. Gagnon. "I had to quit work I was so weak. Now, thanks to Sargol, I look like a new man. I gained 22 pounds in 23 days."

"Sargol has put just 10 pounds on me in 14 days," states W. D. Roberts. "It has made me sleep well, enjoy what I ate and enabled me to work with interest and pleasure."

"I weighed 132 pounds when I commenced taking Sargol. After taking 20 days I weighed 144 pounds. Sargol is the most wonderful preparation for flesh building I have ever seen," declares D. Martin, and J. McIver adds: "For the past twenty years I have taken medicine every day for indigestion and got thinner every year. I took Sargol for forty days and feel better than I have felt in twenty years. My weight has increased from 150 to 170 pounds."

When hundreds of men and women—and there are hundreds, with more coming every day—living in every nook and corner of this broad land voluntarily testify to weight increases ranging all the way from 10 to 35 pounds given them by Sargol, you must admit, Mr. and Mrs. and Miss Thin Reader, that there must be something in this Sargol method of flesh building after all.

Hadn't you better look into it, just as thousands of others have done? Many thin folks say: "I'd give most anything to put on a little extra weight," but when someone suggests a way they exclaim, "Not a chance. Nothing will make me plump. I'm built to stay thin." Until you have tried Sargol, you do not and cannot know that this is true.

Sargol has put pounds of healthy "stay there" flesh on hundreds who doubted, and in spite of their doubts. You don't have to believe in Sargol to grow plump from its use. You just take it and watch weight pile up, hollows vanish and your figure round out to pleasing normal proportions. You weigh yourself when you begin and again when you finish and you let the scales tell the story.

Sargol is absolutely harmless. It is a tiny concentrated tablet. You take one with every meal. It mixes with the food you eat for the purpose of separating all of its flesh producing ingredients. It prepares these fat making elements in an easily assimilated form, which the blood can readily absorb and carry all over your body. Plump, well-developed persons don't need Sargol to produce this result. Their assimilative machinery performs its functions without aid. But thin folks' assimilative organs do not. This fatty portion of their food now goes to waste through their bodies like unburned coal through an open grate. A few days' test of Sargol in your case will surely prove whether or not this is true of you. Isn't it worth trying?

If you want a beautiful and well-rounded figure of symmetrical proportions, if you want to gain some solid pounds of healthy stay-there flesh, if you want to increase your weight to normal, weigh what you should weigh, go straight to your druggist today and get a package of Sargol and use it as directed. Sargol will either increase your weight or it won't and the only way to know is to try it. A single package of Sargol easily enables you to make this test. Sixty days' use of Sargol, according to directions, is absolutely guaranteed to increase your weight to a satisfactory degree or your druggist will refund all the money you have paid him for it. Sargol is sold by leading druggists everywhere and in Honolulu and vicinity by Benson, Smith & Co., Hollister Drug Co. and Chambers Drug Co.